

SUPPLIED UNDER
ROYAL WARRANT



TO HER MAJESTY
THE QUEEN.

"Honest water which no'er left man's thirst to cure."—Shakespeare Timon of Athens.

The finest tribute ever accorded to sterling merit is contained in THE LANCET, of August 3, 1891, pages 507-8, which embodies the "Report of THE LANCET Special Commission on Natural Mineral Waters," "Johannis"—the subject of the Report—being selected from amongst the Natural Mineral Waters of the world as worthy of this distinction.

PROMOTES APPETITE. ASSISTS DIGESTION. PROLONGS LIFE

"JOHANNIS."

THE KING OF NATURAL TABLE WATERS.

CHARGED ENTIRELY WITH ITS OWN NATURAL GAS.

To be obtained from all Chemists, Wine Merchants, and Stores at the following prices per Dozen delivered:—

Bottles.	1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.	Bottles.	1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.
London	6/-	4/6	3/6	Country	6/6
					5/-
					3/9

AND OF ALL W. & A. GILBERT'S AGENTS THROUGHOUT THE KINGDOM.

Springs: ZOLLHAUS, GERMANY. London Offices: 25, REGENT STREET, S.W.

SHAW & SONS,
LAW PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS,
FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.—Arnold's Law relating to Municipal Corporations. Fourth Edition. By WILLIAM W. MACKENZIE, Esq., M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and SIR SAMUEL GEORGE JOHNSON, Town Clerk and Clerk of the Peace of the Town and County of the Town of Nottingham. Now published, price 37s. 6d.; for cash, with order, 30s. 8d.

LAW OF BURIAL, including all the Burial Acts as modified or affected by The Local Government Act, 1894; all the Church Building, New Parish and Poor Law Acts relating to the subject; and the Official Regulations of the Home Office and Local Government Board; with Notes, Cases, and Index. Second Edition. By JAMES BROOKS LITTLE, B.A., Ch. Ch. Oxon., Barrister-at-Law, Inner Temple, Editor of "The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883," "The Law of Allotments," &c. Now published, price 17s. 6d.; for cash, carriage free, 14s. 6d.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACTS, 1875 and 1879, with the Margarine Act, 1887, and the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1903. With Notes and Cases; also practical Observations, bearing upon Legal and Chemical Questions which have arisen in the working of the Acts. Second Edition. By SIR WILLIAM J. BELL, LL.D., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and of the Chemical Society, &c., &c.; and H. S. SCRIVENER, B.A. Oxon., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Now published, price 4s. 6d.; for cash, with order, post-free, 4s.

LONDON: SHAW & SONS, FETTER LANE, E.C.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

TOTAL ASSETS, £2,831,000. INCOME, £318,000.

The Yearly New Business exceeds ONE MILLION.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY.
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.
FREDERICK JOHN BLAKE, Esq.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

VOL. XXXVIII., No. 51.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, OCTOBER 20, 1894.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	801	LAW SOCIETIES.....	806
AUTOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.....	803	COURT PAPERS.....	808
WINDING UP IN THE LEGAL YEAR.....	804	LEGAL NEWS.....	809
1893-1894.....	804	WINDING UP NOTICES.....	809
REVIEWS.....	805	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	809
CORRESPONDENCE.....	806	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	810

PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.

Cases Reported this Week.

(BEFORE THE VACATION JUDGE.)

Kent, Sussex, and General Land Society (Lim.) v. Heathcote and Medlicott 806
Kitts v. Moore & Co. 807

CURRENT TOPICS.

AT THE FINAL Vacation Sitting on Wednesday the Lord Chief Justice disposed of a list of thirty cases, besides some *ex parte* applications, and was able to rise at three o'clock.

BY THE DEATH OF MR. CHARLES J. TOOTELL, of the Central Office, the public service has lost an official of the very best type. Thoroughly versed in the practice of his department, he was always ready to place his knowledge at the service of the public for the purpose of overcoming technical difficulties, and smoothing the way of practitioners; and our readers have frequently been indebted to his pen for observations on current points of practice. His loss is keenly felt in the Central Office, where his singular charm of manner and unfailing kindness of disposition had greatly endeared him to all his colleagues.

THE RETIREMENT OF SIR JOHN RIGBY from political life, for which it was known he had a strong predilection, is, it may be surmised, due mainly to considerations of health; and everyone will hope that the serene atmosphere and comparatively light work of the Court of Appeal will prevent a recurrence of the attacks to which he has been subject. His appointment to the Lord Justiceship is, it need hardly be said, matter for great congratulation. Every lawyer knows his firm grasp of legal principle, extensive knowledge of case law, and power of lucid enunciation. What is not, perhaps, so generally known is his habit of careful and minute investigation of facts. He, beyond most lawyers, has learnt and sedulously put in practice the lesson that the difficulty in advising is, not to find out the law, but to apply it to facts, and although, after the fashion of all exalted leaders, his opinions were commonly a mere statement of the conclusions he had formed, they were invariably based upon a laborious consideration of all the facts of the case and of their bearing upon the application of legal doctrine. He probably never "scamped" a case in his life. Add to this an unusual share of practical good sense and an entire absence of arrogance, and there would seem to be present the qualifications of a great judge.

THE RETIREMENT OF SIR AUGUSTUS STEPHENSON from the posts of Solicitor to the Treasury and Director of Public Prosecutions, although if we are correctly informed, his successor has already been selected, affords an opportunity for considering the duties of, and qualifications for, the office. The duties of Solicitor to the Treasury are tolerably well known. Under the Act creating the office (42 & 43 Vict. c. 22) the duties of the Director of Public Prosecutions are stated to be "under the superintendence of the Attorney-General to institute, undertake, or carry on such criminal proceedings (whether in the Court for Crown Cases Reserved, before sessions of Oyer and Terminer or of the Peace, before magistrates or otherwise), and to give such advice and assistance to chief officers of police, clerks to justices, and other persons, whether officers or not, concerned in any criminal proceeding respecting the conduct of that proceeding, as may be for the time being prescribed by regulations under this Act, or may be directed in a special case by the Attorney-General"; and it is provided that these regulations shall provide for the Director taking

action "in cases which appear to be of importance or difficulty, or in which special circumstances, or the refusal or failure of a person to proceed with a prosecution, appear to render the action of such Director necessary to secure the due prosecution of an offender." By section 3 the Director is to be either a barrister or a solicitor in actual practice, and of not less standing than ten years. So far it is plain that barristers and solicitors are equally eligible for the office. But then came the Act of 47 & 48 Vict. c. 58, under which the person for the time being holding the office of Treasury Solicitor is to be Director of Public Prosecutions; we have, therefore, to seek the qualification for the former office. As to this, the provision of the Solicitors Act, 1843, s. 47, that nothing therein contained shall extend or be construed to extend to the admission or any rights or privileges of any persons appointed to be solicitor of the Treasury, appears to indicate tolerably plainly that it was contemplated that the office might be held by a solicitor, but the Act which incorporates the Treasury Solicitor (39 & 40 Vict. c. 18) makes no provision on the subject. We think it may reasonably be asked whether, seeing that there happen at the present time to be solicitors peculiarly well qualified both for the post of Solicitor to the Treasury and for that of Director of Public Prosecutions, the experiment of appointing one of them might not have been advantageously tried. The question is not really one between the bar and the solicitors, but between the latter and an official who is only nominally a member of the bar.

It is with much regret that we announce the death of Mr. WALTER BLACKETT TRUVELYAN, one of the Masters of the Bench of the Middle Temple. He never reached that degree of public recognition to which he was fairly entitled, both by his abilities and by his learning; but for many years before his death his extraordinary attainments had been the admiration of a considerable circle, numbering among them some of the most eminent members both of the bench and the bar. There is much reason to suppose that with him we have lost the last of the race of deeply learned lawyers. He began practice as a pleader, and did not originally contemplate being called to the bar; but when the Common Law Procedure Acts had (as the pleaders averred) made an end of the art of pleading, he was called, and entered into general practice on the common law side. With health that was somewhat delicate, and tastes that were somewhat fastidious, he never pushed himself into the prominence of a "great practice," such as has been attained by many inferior men; and he probably did not desire it. His practice, however, was by no means inconsiderable, and it was much more remarkable from its quality than its quantity. It seemed to be made up of those interesting but difficult cases which involve a reference to knowledge which is unfamiliar because it seldom emerges into actual life. Thus Mr. TRUVELYAN'S practice resembled a kind of museum, consisting almost wholly of what to other men are rare and curious specimens. His learning was as wide as it was deep, and in the judgment of some competent persons his opinions on equity law were more valuable than those of most, if not all, of the equity lawyers—a fact which shows that, as his friends knew, his erudition was as remote as possible from the impracticability of the Dry-as-dust. That such a mine should now be closed for ever, without any of its treasures having been embodied in the literature of the law, is a subject for lasting regret. We can only write its epitaph, where we would more gladly point to its existing monument.

OUR CORRESPONDENT W. H. W., whose letter we print in another column, appears to have suffered somewhat in consequence of having assumed that, in matters of procedure, the letter and the spirit of the law are in harmony with one another. The peculiarity in our complex system of procedure to which he calls attention shows how far too favourable in this respect was his view of our statutory provisions governing the practice of the High Court. He has done well to call attention to this matter, for he is by no means the first member of the profession who has had a rude awakening from the same impression. Section 116

of the County Courts Act, 1888, contains the following proviso: "Provided that if in any action founded on contract the plaintiff shall within twenty-one days after service of the writ, or within such further time as may be ordered by the High Court or a judge thereof, obtain an order under order 14 . . . he shall be entitled to costs according to the scale for the time being in use in the Supreme Court." If we look merely at the letter of this provision read with its context, we find that a person who commences an action of contract in the High Court, for a sum not less than £20 but less than £50, can only receive county court costs unless he obtains an order for judgment under order 14 within twenty-one days from the service of the writ. A good many other practitioners besides our correspondent have interpreted that proviso to mean something more than it actually says. They have concluded that its intention was to secure to a suitor the right to Supreme Court costs if he sued by specially-indorsed writ on a claim entitling him to summary judgment under order 14. It is not at all improbable that such was the original intention of those who obtained the insertion of the proviso in section 116. If so, the clause as it stands does not carry out such intention at all. It certainly gives no right to a plaintiff, suing by specially-indorsed writ, to Supreme Court costs in any case where no defence is attempted, and where the claim is below £50. If a defendant served allows judgment to go by default, for example, the plaintiff in a "country or agency" case is entitled, on entering judgment, to £4 12s. costs, with £1 added for substituted service, which allowance is based on the county court scale. These costs our correspondent could have obtained if he had insisted upon it, as he was entitled to do. If he had offered to accept the above amount after deducting the cost of entering judgment, his offer could hardly have been refused, or, if it had been refused, he could have served the writ although the debt was paid and entered judgment in default for £5 12s. costs. He would thus have obtained his costs of substituted service. On the other hand, if the defendant had not settled, but had entered an appearance, the plaintiff could have proceeded at once to judgment under order 14, in which case the costs of substituted service would have formed part of the Supreme Court costs to which he would have become entitled. Having compromised the action before service and agreed to accept whatever costs he was entitled to on taxation, our correspondent would appear to have lost his right to costs of the order for substituted service, no service having been effected.

AN INTERESTING point as to the effect of rule (2) in Schedule I, Part I., to the General Order under the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881, is raised in a letter from Mr. MATHER which we print elsewhere. The rule is intended to prescribe the remuneration of a solicitor for conducting a sale when, after property has been offered by auction and bought in, a sale by private treaty is negotiated by the vendor's solicitor. It provides that, under such circumstances, "he is to be entitled to charge commission according to the above scales"—that is, the scale in Schedule I, Part I.—"on the reserved price where the property is not sold, and also one-half of the commission for negotiating the sale." Clearly the rule only contemplates the case where the solicitor is entitled to a conducting fee on the auction, and since the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Drielsma v. Mansfield* (42 W. R. 578) he has ceased to be allowed this fee when, according to the common practice in the North of England, an auctioneer, paid by the client, is employed at a fixed charge to receive the bids, the actual work of conducting the sale being done by the solicitor. If the solicitor is entitled to the conducting fee, the effect of the rule is clear. He gets the conducting fee on the reserve price and also one-half of the negotiating fee. What is to happen if, as in the case just mentioned, he is not entitled to the conducting fee, and therefore charges on the old system as altered by Schedule II.? Mr. MATHER suggests that he is in the same position for the purpose of the rule in question as if he had received the conducting fee. He is entitled, that is, to only half the negotiating fee; and a decision to this effect has been given by the registrar of the Lancaster Palatine Court. On the other hand, in a similar case, the district registrar of the High Court at Liverpool allowed the full negotiating fee for the sale by private treaty, but reduced the charges for conducting the

auction to a fee of three guineas in addition to the amount paid to the auctioneer. We confess we do not understand this latter decision. Either rule (2) applies or it does not. If it applies, the decision in the Palatine Court appears to be correct. In whichever way the solicitor is paid for the auction he is only to have one-half of the negotiating fee. If, on the other hand, it does not apply, what authority is there for reducing his proper charges in respect of the auction? He must, in this event, be entitled to charge for the auction on the old system, as altered by Schedule II., and also the full negotiating fee. This seems to be the correct alternative. For our own part we imagine that rule (2) must be considered to apply. The omission to notice the case in which the solicitor does not receive the conducting fee, but is entitled to charge for the auction on the old system, is not surprising. Though such a mode of charging has been sanctioned by judicial decision, the framers of the Remuneration Order do not appear to have actually contemplated it. Bearing this in mind, it is reasonable to suppose that in construing rule (2) the omission must be supplied by making the words expressly referring to the scale conducting fee apply also, by implication, to charges for conducting based on the old system. The vendor's solicitor, that is, gets in respect of the auction either the scale conducting fee or a fee calculated on the old system; but, in either case, he is entitled to only one-half of the negotiating fee on the subsequent sale by private treaty.

WHEN A COMPANY, having the power to create new shares, allots such shares to shareholders in lieu of the payment of dividend, questions frequently arise, in cases where the original shares are settled on a tenant for life and remaindermen, whether the new shares are to be treated as capital or income. The principle applicable to the subject was stated by Fry, L.J., in delivering the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *Re Bouch* (33 W. R. 621, 29 Ch. D. 635). When the company has the power, either of distributing its profits as dividend or of converting them into capital, any exercise of its power is binding on all persons interested in the settled shares; and, consequently, what is paid by the company as dividend goes to the tenant for life, and what is paid by the company to the shareholder as capital enures to the benefit of all who are interested in the capital. In that case the House of Lords (12 App. Cas. 385), while adopting this statement of principle, differed from the Court of Appeal as to the facts. A company declared a bonus dividend, and at the same time authorized the creation of new shares, which were to be offered to the existing shareholders. It was intended that the bonus should be applied in paying the amount due on the new shares. The House of Lords held that, under the circumstances, the declaration of the bonus dividend and the allotment of the new shares formed, in effect, only one transaction; and, consequently, as the result was an increase of the capital of the company, the new shares were held for all parties entitled under the settlement, and did not go to the tenant for life. If, however, the declaration of the dividend and the issue of new shares in payment of which the dividend may be applied are really distinct matters, subsequent cases show that a different result will be arrived at. In *Re Northage* (60 L. J. Ch. 488) a bonus dividend was declared, and at the same time new shares were created and offered to the shareholders, but it was optional with them whether they would take the dividend in cash or in shares. Trustees, with the consent of the tenant for life, took new shares. These were sold for £1,363, and the amount of the dividend was £750. The tenant for life claimed to be allowed £750 out of the proceeds, though he admitted that the balance belonged to the estate, and NORTH, J., allowed his claim. A similar question arose recently before STIRLING, J., in *Re Malam* (ante, p. 708), and was decided in the same way. The actual option to take the dividend in shares instead of in cash was exercised by the tenant for life, the trustees having waived it in his favour; but this circumstance was not allowed to make any difference. The shares, when allotted, represented capital, and became part of the corpus of the settled property, though, since the payments on account of them had been practically made by the trustees out of moneys belonging to the tenant for life, the amount had to be refunded to her.

THE DECISION of ROMER, J., in *Jones v. Daniel* (42 W. R. 687), following that of JESSEL, M.R., in *Crossley v. Maycock* (22 W. R. 387, L. R. 18 Eq. 180), shows the danger incurred by a vendor, anxious to accept an offer to purchase, if he in any way makes his acceptance dependent upon special conditions. In *Crossley v. Maycock* the vendor, in accepting an offer, enclosed two copies of conditions of sale signed by him, requesting the purchaser also to sign and return one of the copies. This the purchaser declined to do. It was held that there was no final agreement which the court would enforce. Sir GEORGE JESSEL drew a distinction between cases where the acceptor merely states his desire that a formal contract should be drawn up, and those where the agreement is made subject to certain conditions then specified or thereafter to be specified. In the former case there may be a final agreement before any formal contract is entered into. In the latter there is no such agreement until the conditions are accepted. The case of *Jones v. Daniel* was very similar. An intending purchaser offered by letter to purchase certain property for £1,450. In reply the vendor's solicitors wrote to accept the offer, and enclosed a contract for the purchaser's signature. The contract contained a condition limiting the title to be shewn by the vendor and other terms. To this the purchaser made no reply, and after further letters from the vendor's solicitors he wrote that he would not purchase the property and returned the contract unsigned. It was held by ROMER, J., in an action for specific performance brought by the vendor, that there had been no unconditional acceptance of the intending purchaser's offer, and consequently, in the absence of acceptance by him of the vendor's terms, there was no binding agreement.

AUTOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.

THERE are two very different manners in which a change in the law may be made. The draft of the proposed new law may be published so as to afford an opportunity to those whose interests will be affected by the proposed change to state their objections to it, or the change may be made without this opportunity being given. The first of these two schemes may perhaps be called the "democratic," the latter the "autocratic," method. In this country we have a democratic Constitution, and yet many changes in the law are made in the autocratic method. This appears very clearly when we remember what a large number of rules made by different departments of Government have statutory authority.

It must not be thought that where the change in the law is effected by statute it is necessarily discussed by the public, for sometimes the Bill escapes notice and is passed without any discussion. Very good examples of the importance of public discussion will be found in the case of Acts passed for the purpose of giving effect to the resolutions passed by the House of Commons in Committee of Supply. We will consider two cases, in one of which no discussion took place, in the other of which the details of the Act were thoroughly discussed by the public. By the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 7, s. 18), which was passed without discussion, land was practically rendered unsaleable. Public outcry arose, and the obnoxious provision was repealed by the Revenue Act, 1889, passed in the same session. On the other hand, full opportunity was given for the discussion of the Finance Bill of the present year, and, as our readers are aware, many provisions of the Bill which would have caused great hardship were struck out.

As another example let us consider changes in the law made by rule. One would have thought *a priori* that the judges meeting in consultation would hardly go astray in making rules of procedure. They are very able men, they have vast experience, they are thoroughly conversant with the practice of the courts, and yet it has been found necessary to provide that in ordinary cases rules made by them are not to take effect till at least forty days after publication, and that any suggestions made by a public body during that time are to be taken into consideration before the rules are finally settled (see the Rules Publication Act, 1893). Unfortunately the provisions of the Act last cited do not extend to rules

made by the Revenue Department, and the result is that the forms provided for the passing of accounts with respect to estate duty contain provisions, probably *ultra vires*, certainly oppressive to the public, and one of which is ambiguously expressed. They require the executor to state whether the deceased left a husband, wife, lawful issue, or lawful lineal ancestor surviving, and whether a child has attained twenty-one, or, being a daughter, has married. The amount of duty does not depend on either of the facts required to be stated, therefore the requirement is *ultra vires*, the necessity of ascertaining the facts is oppressive, as it throws an unlawful burden on the executor; and lastly, it is impossible to say what is required to be stated owing to the ambiguity in the word "issue." This word, when used in a legal document, means "descendants," but in its popular meaning it means "children." It is hardly possible to say in which of these meanings it is used in this place; perhaps the employment of the word "child" in the statement that "No child has attained twenty-one," tends to shew that it is used in the former meaning. If this be the true view, the burden on the executor will be intolerable, owing to the necessity for ascertaining all the descendants—children, grandchildren, and possibly even great grandchildren of the deceased.

Again, the executor is required to give an account of all the property of which the deceased was trustee, and the names and addresses of the surviving trustees and beneficiaries; this is not necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of duty, and is therefore an illegal requirement. It is most oppressive to the public, as, if enforced, it will cause great trouble and expense.

Again, there appears to be an important omission in the statement required. The Act provides (section 7 (10)) that "Property passing on any death shall not be aggregated more than once nor shall estate duty in respect thereof be more than once levied on the same death." We can find no provision against double aggregation in the forms. Consider the common case where A. on his marriage covenants to pay £10,000 to the trustees of his marriage settlement, by which that sum is settled on trusts under which he takes the first life interest. Suppose that A. does not pay off the sum in his lifetime and dies possessed of personality worth £30,000. The executor is not allowed to deduct the debt of £10,000 from the £30,000, and the forms appear to make no provision authorizing the trustees of the settlement to decline to pay duty on the £10,000 on the ground that it is paid by the executor; so that, according to the forms, duty appears to be demanded on the £10,000 as forming part of the estate of £30,000, duty on which is payable by the executor, and also on the £10,000, part of the settled property, duty on which is payable by the trustees of the settlement, making in all an aggregation of £40,000. Surely if an opportunity had been afforded for public discussion all these difficulties would have been avoided.

Perhaps the most serious instance of the danger of changing the law without public discussion is afforded by the Land Transfer Act of 1875, which was accepted by Parliament on the authority of that great real property lawyer Earl Cairns, and was not discussed by the public. A reference to the files of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL for 1875 will prove the truth of this statement. Now, what has been the result? The safety of a purchaser of land depends upon the vendor shewing that possession goes with the title and that he possesses the title deeds. The Act renders it unnecessary for the vendor to shew that he has possession, thus destroying one safeguard against fraud; and by a regulation of the office, made without any public discussion, the other security against fraud—viz., the production of the certificate of title—has been abolished; add to which that it appears by an advertisement which constantly appears in the *Times*, and apparently proceeds from the office, that a purchaser ought always to search the register to see whether the land that he purchases has been registered. In other words, the existence of the Act is a standing danger to all landowners whose titles are not registered. It is impossible to produce a more striking example of the danger of changing the law without public discussion. Experience shows that even if an able body of men legislate in secrecy on a matter that they thoroughly understand, it is quite certain that, as soon as the provisions of the new law are made known to the public,

something not known to the legislators will be discovered which prevents the law from working smoothly. In other words, autocratic government is a failure.

WINDING UP IN THE LEGAL YEAR 1893-1894.

II.

THE much-talked-of legislation with reference to debentures has not yet appeared, but a few additions to the case law on the subject call for notice, as many points as to debentures arise both in winding up proper and liquidation in debenture-holders' actions. *Davies v. R. Bolton & Co.* (ante, p. 650, W. N., 1894, p. 148) is an important decision as to the effect of the frequently found article protecting outside persons dealing with a company, notwithstanding irregularities have occurred in the conduct of its internal affairs. Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS made some strong observations as to the law allowing one-man companies to do things which would not be tolerated in the case of an individual trader. The validity of the debenture in question was, however, upheld, though the only director who assisted at its being sealed and signed was the person in whose favour it was given. The successful plaintiff was a purchaser for value without notice. In *Re Queensland Land and Coal Co.*, *Davis v. Martin* (ante, pp. 579, 644, 42 W. R. 600, W. N., 1894, p. 121) debentures, some of which were in blank, were secured by a covering deed; and Mr. Justice NORTH held that, although those which were in blank were void, the holders had an equitable security for the amount of their loans, and ranked *pari passu* with the holders of the other debentures in the property realized under the covering deed. This is not the only case in which the court has recently given full effect to the rights of secured creditors—for debenture-holders really are in that position. The Court of Appeal in *Wallace v. Universal Automatic Machine Co.* (42 W. R. 428; 1894, 2 Ch. 547; commented on ante, p. 611) held that the principal money secured by debentures containing a covenant for payment on a certain day, with interest in the meantime, and charging the undertaking, became due and owing on a winding up occurring before that day, though there was no condition making the sum payable in case of winding up or in default on payment of interest. And Mr. Justice KEKEWICH has held, in *Sadler v. Worley* (42 W. R. 476; 1894, 2 Ch. 170; commented on ante, p. 346), that the remedy by foreclosure is applicable to the uncalled capital when comprised in the security of the debenture-holders.

In *Re Industrial and General Trust or British Linen Co. v. South American and Mexican Co.* (42 W. R. 181; 1894, 1 Ch. 108) the Court of Appeal in substance indorsed Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS' observations as to when the official receiver is to be appointed receiver in a debenture-holders' action. It turned out, however, that a portion of the assets in this particular case consisted of securities which required to be realized by someone better acquainted with such matters than the official receiver, and therefore the Court of Appeal, though it allowed him to remain receiver of the other assets, appointed another person to realize the securities. It has often been held that, and occasionally doubted whether, the court could empower the receiver in a debenture-holders' action to borrow money as a first charge on the undertaking, with priority over the debentures, for the preservation of the property. The Court of Appeal has now sanctioned a transaction of this everyday character (*Greenwood v. Algeiras Railway*, 1894, 2 Ch. 205).

Somerset v. Land Securities Co. (ante, p. 602, 42 W. R. 602, W. N., 1894, pp. 129, 168) is a case which is interesting, but as form no part of the law which is useful as a guide in future proceedings. The company was the only one which availed itself of the Mortgage Debenture Acts. The author or authors of those enactments apparently never contemplated that any company which locked up its securities in the embraces of the Land Registry could come to such a pass as winding up. But the Land Securities Co. went into voluntary liquidation, which was continued under supervision. The receiver wanted the securities, and Mr. Justice WRIGHT held he ought to have them. The Court of Appeal ruled otherwise, and officialism triumphed; but without creating a precedent!

The clause now usually inserted in debenture trust deeds

enabling the majority to bind the minority, has had to fight its way, and it succeeded in doing so before the beginning of the current legal year. The cases of *Mercantile Investment and General Trust Co. v. River Plate Trust Loan and Agency Co.* (42 W. R. 365; 1894, 1 Ch. 578), and *Collingham v. Sloper* (W. N., 1894, v. 168) have thrown no discredit on the clause.

Several important contributory cases have been decided. Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS' decision in *Re Macdonald, Sons, & Co.* (37 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 703) was affirmed on appeal (*ante*, p. 25; 1894, 1 Ch. 89). The persons who were held not to be contributories had been promised founders' paid-up shares. The certificates, which did not state that the shares were fully paid, were returned by them to the secretary before winding up. It was held, in substance, that they had never agreed to take any shares except fully-paid shares, and that it was immaterial that there was no registered contract. The case seems to have been rightly decided, but it is one in which a judge might easily have gone wrong. *Re Harvey's Oyster Co., Ormerod's case* (*ante*, p. 459; 42 W. R. 701; 1894, 2 Ch. 474), adds little, if anything, to the small amount of case law as to underwriting letters. Mr. Justice STIRLING's decision in *Hamilton v. Vaughan-Sherrin Electrical Engineering Co.* (*ante*, p. 663, W. N., 1894, p. 164), as to the right of an infant shareholder to prove for application and allotment moneys paid by the infant, has already been commented on (*ante*, p. 659).

The subject of directors' liability as contributories in respect of qualification shares has occupied the attention of judges of first instance in several cases, some of which have been taken to the Court of Appeal. *Cammell's case* (*ante*, p. 184, 437; 1894, 2 Ch. 392), in which Mr. Justice STIRLING's decision was affirmed, establishes that where a director has not applied for shares, he cannot be fixed with liability for his qualification shares merely because he has acted as a director at a time during which the articles empowered him to act without qualifying. The director in *Cammell's case* had a month in which to qualify, and during the month, but not after its expiration, he acted as a director. He resigned after the month had expired, and it was held he was not liable, although, without his knowledge, the shares were allotted to him, and his name was placed on the register. Very similar is *Salisbury-Jones and Dale's case* (*ante*, p. 546, 663, W. N., 1894, pp. 112, 151), in which Mr. Justice WRIGHT's decision was reversed on appeal. A well-drawn set of articles now always provides that a director may act before acquiring his qualification shares, but shall in any case acquire the same within a certain time after his appointment, and that, unless he does so, he shall "be deemed to have agreed to take the shares from the company, and that the same shall be forthwith allotted to him accordingly." In *Isaacs' case* (1892, 2 Ch. 158) an article to this effect was held sufficient to fix with liability a director who had acted as such. But in *Salisbury-Jones and Dale's case* the persons whom it was sought to retain on the list had ceased to be directors before the end of the period allowed to them for qualifying, and this was held sufficient to distinguish the case from *Isaacs' case*. But Lord Justice LINDLEY and Mr. Justice WRIGHT did not acquiesce in this view. *Re Heronynia Copper Co.* is another case in which the form of article, *plus* acting as a director, has been held sufficient to render a director liable for qualification shares. Mr. Justice WRIGHT's decision is reported *ante*, p. 218, and has already been commented on (*ante*, p. 211). It was affirmed on appeal (*ante*, p. 218; 42 W. R. 593; 1894, 2 Ch. 403). *Dunster's case*, as decided in the Court of Appeal (*ante*, p. 694, W. N., 1894, p. 167), is one of those cases which seem to unsettle the law. DUNSTER was one of the first directors named in the articles, and he signed the articles for 100 shares. Then he applied in the name of his partnership firm for 100 fully-paid shares, which were allotted in the name of the firm, that name alone being placed on the register. Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS held (*ante*, p. 649, W. N., 1894, 147) that Dunster was a contributory for 100 shares; but the Court of Appeal held that there was only one transaction as to 100 shares, and that Dunster was not liable. The Appeal Court decision seems to give the go-by to section 23 of the Act of 1862, and ought to be taken to the House of Lords.

Re Brewery Assets Corporation (Truman's case) (*ante*, p. 602, W. N., 1894, p. 129) follows a former decision that an applica-

tion for shares may be verbally withdrawn before allotment, and is of some value as shewing that the acting clerks of the company have authority to receive such communications as withdrawals of applications. The decision is Mr. Justice WRIGHT's.

The facts in *Re Peruvian Guano Co.* (*ante*, p. 664, W. N., 1894, p. 142) are too complicated to be stated here. Mr. Justice WRIGHT took the businesslike view that, in the case of a solvent company, directors are entitled to a percentage allowed by the articles on the amount of a dividend *bond fide* declared, though subsequent events shew that the dividend was based on an over-estimate of the value of some of the assets, and could not have been paid out of net profits.

The subject of paying dividends out of profits has also been dealt with by Mr. Justice KEKEWICH in *Lever v. Land Securities Co.* (*ante*, p. 38, 42 W. R. 104, W. N., 1894, p. 21), and in the well-known case of *Verner v. General and Commercial Investment Trust* (*ante*, pp. 308, 384; 1894, 2 Ch. 239), which has already been fully discussed in these columns (*ante*, pp. 304, 379).

The issuing of shares at a discount comes before the winding-up court about as often as payment of dividends out of capital. It has been held that a person to whom shares have been issued at a discount is liable to pay up the whole amount, not only to pay creditors and the costs of winding up, but also to adjust the rights of shareholders *inter se* (*Re Railway Time Tables Publishing Co.*, *ante*, p. 676, W. N., 1894, p. 165).

Mr. Justice NORTH's decision in *Malleison v. National Insurance and Guarantee Corporation* (*ante*, p. 80; 1894, 1 Ch. 200), that a company cannot contract itself out of the power to alter its articles, seems open to doubt—at any rate, when a clause forbidding alteration is inserted in the memorandum of association. The question is one of some importance in winding up, having regard to the fact that such prohibitory clauses often relate—as in the case before Mr. Justice NORTH—to the power to call up capital.

Re Eddystons Marine Insurance Co. (*ante*, p. 253, W. N., 1894, p. 30) has already been commented on (*ante*, p. 266). It affords another warning to transferees of shares to examine their certificates; and if "bonus" is written across them, this means that they are not good, but that it will be only common prudence to consult a solicitor.

REVIEWS.

THE NEW DEATH DUTIES.

THE FINANCE ACT, 1894 (57 & 58 VICT. c. 30), SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO ESTATE DUTY AND THE SUCCESSION DUTY; WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES. By J. E. CRAWFORD MUNRO, LL.M., Barrister-at-Law. Eyre & Spottiswoode.

This work is distinguished by disquisitions on the law applicable to, as distinguished from a mere account of, the Finance Act. A very good example of these discussions will be found in the explanation of the word "property" at page 3. The introduction contains a lucid account of the Act, and the body of the book gives the Act with notes on each section. The result of our perusal of these notes is to shew that on the whole the law is laid down correctly, and that the book will be found a useful guide to the construction of the Act.

THE LAW QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE LAW QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart. October. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Mr. Charles Sweet continues in this number of the *Law Quarterly Review* the discussion of the meaning of the term *chose in action* commenced in a recent number by Sir Howard Elphinstone. From an elaborate investigation of the authorities he draws the conclusion that the term is used in at least two senses. *Prima facie* it means a debt, or a sum of money payable under a contract. In a more extended and technical sense it includes shares and stocks. It is so used, observes Mr. Sweet, in the Bankruptcy Act and in the old law of husband and wife. In a still wider sense it includes many rights treated in the old books as things in action, such as rights of action for torts, rights of entry, &c., and also, he submits, some rights of more modern origin, such as patents, copyrights, and trade-marks. According to Sir Howard Elphinstone, the term is never used now for a right of action in respect of a tort, and he would, of course, exclude also rights of entry. He considers it doubtful too whether it includes patents, copyrights, and trade-marks. Otherwise the con-

clusions of these two authorities appear to be the same. The editor varies the discussion by dealing with the general question, "What is a Thing?" From the consideration of things corporeal and things incorporeal, things single and things collective, he leads us finally to notions similar, in the province of law, to those of Berkeley in the province of metaphysics. With Berkeley things exist only in the sensations of sentient beings. So in law a thing is recognized only by the legal relations in which it stands to persons. "On the whole, perhaps," says Sir Frederick Pollock, "we have good ground for saying that the 'thing' of legal contemplation, even when we have to do with a material object, is not precisely the object as we find it in common experience, but rather the entirety of its possible legal relations to persons." Whatever may be thought of the value of such speculations, the article forms a strong contrast to the one which precedes it. Mr. Ernest C. C. Firth contributes an interesting article on "The Quasi-Grant of Easements in English and Roman Law." The doctrine that a grant of the quasi-dominant tenement carries with it the creation of an actual easement, provided the quasi-servient tenement is retained by the grantor, on the ground that the grantor cannot derogate from his own grant, has only been arrived at after much discussion, and Mr. Firth argues that it contrasts unfavourably with the simpler rule of the civil law, according to which the creation of easements depends entirely on the actual contract between the parties. In "Maintenance and Education" Mr. T. K. Nuttall combats the opinion of Hall, V.C., in *Wilkins v. Jodrell* (13 Ch. D. 564) that a gift of an annuity for "maintenance and education" should, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, be construed as a gift for life, and, by a careful examination of the judgment of Lord Camden in *Knapp v. Noyes*, he seeks to give the effect of a general principle to the *dictum* in that case, "maintenance and education are confined to minority"—words which Hall, V.C., understood as referring only to the terms of the particular will. The remaining articles, on "Some Points of Difference between English and Scotch Law," by Mr. J. A. Lovat-Fraser, and "The Institute of International Law," by Mr. Thomas Barclay, we noticed last week. The present number completes the tenth volume of the Review, and it contains an index for the whole period of contributors, subjects of articles, and books reviewed.

CASE LAW.

RULING CASES. Arranged, annotated, and edited by ROBERT CAMPBELL, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, assisted by other members of the Bar. With American Notes by IRVING BROWNE. Vol. I., Abandonment—Action. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

This is the first volume of a work of unusual value and interest. The mass of case law is already vast, and it is increasing rapidly and steadily. It is becoming more and more difficult for the practitioner to have in his own library the reports of cases to which he is continually compelled to refer. One attempt to cope with the difficulty has been made by the issue of the series of Revised Reports, but this aims simply at abridging the volume of the authorities, not at arranging and classifying them. The work which is being carried out by Mr. Campbell and his assistants seems to occupy a position between the Revised Reports and the various collections of leading cases. In these collections the leading case is frequently of secondary importance. Their chief value lies in the admirable notes, which usually form a complete treatise on the subject dealt with by the case. The present issue reverses this arrangement. The leading cases are the chief feature, and although there are notes, frequently both interesting and full, yet they are strictly subordinate to the report of the case to which they refer. They are largely concerned with brief statements of kindred authorities which must be considered in connection with the leading case. In addition to the English notes, Mr. Irving Browne has contributed American notes, which state how far the law laid down in the leading case has been accepted in the United States, and give references to numerous American authorities. The present volume contains the reports of sixty-six cases, arranged under nine heads. The subjects of greatest general interest, perhaps, are "Inevitable Accident" and "Right of Action." To the former eleven cases are allotted, including, of course, *Fletcher v. Rylands*, with the qualifying decision in *Nichols v. Marsland*. The note to these affords a good example of Mr. Campbell's method. He discusses, in the compass of about a page, the principles which they establish, and then gives a short statement of some twenty cases dealing with the same subject. Under "Right of Action" nineteen cases are collected, sub-divided into five sections. *Ashby v. White* is given in section 1 as the ruling case on the general principle *ubi jus ibi remedium*, and in the same section *Wedgwood v. Bailey* illustrates the rule that a plaintiff recovers according to the right which he has at the time of bringing the action. The notes to this case discuss *Backhouse v. Bonomi* and the subsequent authorities on the difficult question when the right of action accrues in respect of damage caused by subsidence due to mining operations. The fourth section

is devoted to causes of action arising out of contracts with third persons, and includes the decisions in *Lumley v. Gye* and *Bowen v. Hall*. According to the American notes an action for inducing a man to break his contract with a third person lies generally in that country, but the matter does not seem to be assisted by quoting an authority for the proposition that "if a man enters on another's premises to entice away his servant, he is a trespasser." The fifth section deals with "*damnum absque injuria*," and gives as the first leading case *Chasmore v. Richards*. The same section contains the admirable judgment of Erle, C.J., in *Kennedy v. Broun*, negating the right of a barrister to sue for his fees, and the liability of the Crown in respect of the acts of its servants is considered in *The Queen v. Lords Commissioners of the Treasury* and the notes thereon. In addition to the above we may notice an interesting American note under "Accumulation" (p. 519) on the extent to which accumulation and perpetuities are allowed in the various States. Each leading case or group of cases is preceded by a statement in bold type of the rule which they are quoted as establishing. The work is happy in conception, and this first volume shews that it will be adequately and successfully carried out. If the editor and the publishers can complete the series speedily they will increase the obligation under which they have laid the profession.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A Treatise on the Law of Charter-parties. By EUGENE LEGGETT, Solicitor and Notary Public. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

A Constitutional History of the House of Lords, from Original Sources. By LUKE OWEN PIKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Macmillan & Co.

The Statutes of Practical Utility, arranged in Alphabetical and Chronological Order, with Notes and Indexes; being the Fifth Edition of Chitty's Statutes. By J. M. LELY, Barrister-at-Law. Two Vols. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Stevens & Sons (Limited).

A Compendium of Sheriff Law, especially in relation to Writs of Execution. By PHILIP E. MATHER, Solicitor and Notary. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The Election of Parish Councils under the Local Government Act, 1894. By F. ROWLEY PARKER, Solicitor and Parliamentary Agent. Knight & Co.

A Digest (Alphabetically arranged) of the (a) Law or Principles and (b) Practice (fully detailed) of and in (1) Administrations, (2) Executorships, and (3) Trusteeships respectively. By FRED. WOOD, Barrister-at-Law. Horace Cox.

The Building Societies Act, 1894, with Notes thereon and an Introduction; also the Building Societies Acts, 1874, 1875, 1877, 1884. By IVOR BOWEN, Barrister-at-Law, and W. J. WARLEY, Assistant Official Receiver of the High Court under the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890. Butterworths.

Provisional Orders of the Board of Trade in reference to Gas and Water, Tramway, Pier and Harbour, and Electric Light Undertakings; being a Manual of Practice for Promoters, Opponents, and others. By FRANCIS J. CROWTHER, Parliamentary Agent. Second Edition. Jordan & Sons.

Adulteration (Agricultural Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs). By FRANCIS H. CRIPPS-DAY, M.A. (Cantab), Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Statutes Relating to Church and Clergy. Reprinted from the Fifth Edition of Chitty's Statutes of Practical Utility. By J. M. LELY, Barrister-at-Law, with Preface and Index by BENJAMIN WHITEHEAD, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited); Stevens & Sons (Limited).

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEGOTIATING FEE AFTER SALE BY AUCTION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—A question has recently been raised at Liverpool as to what is the correct practice with regard to the negotiation fee on a sale by private contract where there has been an abortive sale by auction at which an auctioneer has been employed.

It has now been decided by the Court of Appeal (see *Drielsma v. Munifold* and other cases), that when an auctioneer is employed at a sale, even if he only receives the bids, the solicitor cannot charge the conducting fee under Schedule I., but must be remunerated for the work according to the old practice as altered by Schedule II.

The further question has been raised whether, when such a sale by auction proves abortive and the solicitor subsequently negotiates a sale by private treaty, he is entitled to charge the whole or only half of the negotiating fee or item charges for the negotiations.

Rule 2 is in the following form:—"When property offered for sale by auction is bought in and terms of sale are afterwards negotiated and arranged by a solicitor, he is to be entitled to charge commission according to the above scale on the reserve price where the property is not sold and also one-half of the commission for negotiating the sale."

I have recently been engaged in two cases at Liverpool where this point has arisen, but with different results, and in both of these cases I was opposed to the claims made by the solicitors. The Lancaster Palatine Court and the District Registry of the High Court both have offices at Liverpool exercising (so far as the county of Lancaster is concerned) concurrent jurisdiction.

In the first case, in the Palatine Court, Mr. Registrar Taylor decided that as the solicitor had been allowed the full charges according to the old practice as altered by Schedule II. for conducting the sale, he was only entitled to be allowed, under the above-quoted rule, one-half of the commission according to Schedule I. for subsequently negotiating the sale.

In the second case, in the District Registry of the High Court, Mr. Registrar Lowndes decided to allow the solicitor the whole of the commission according to Schedule I. for negotiating the sale, but at the same time reduced the charges for conducting the sale to a nominal sum of £3 3s., besides allowing the amount paid to the auctioneer.

Which of these decisions proceeded on the more correct basis? Possibly as I succeeded in my argument before the first tribunal and failed to convince the second one, I may look at the matter through somewhat coloured spectacles, but I confess that the first decision commends itself to my mind rather than the other.

Of course the difficulty really arises on account of the decisions that a solicitor cannot charge a conducting fee for an auction unless he takes out an auctioneer's licence and himself receives the bids—a result which I can hardly think the framers of the order intended—but as we are bound to accept these decisions as binding until a case is carried, as I hope will be some day, to the House of Lords, it has always appeared to me that if a solicitor is paid for all his work in conducting the auction under Schedule II. he is really placed in the same position, so far as a subsequent negotiating fee is concerned, as if he had been remunerated for the sale under Schedule I., and that therefore he is only entitled to one-half of the negotiating fee.

At the same time I know that there are many others who take a different view, and contend that the negotiating fee is only to be reduced to one-half in case the solicitor has been remunerated for the sale under Schedule I.

The point must, I think, have frequently occurred in practice, and if you, sir, or some of your readers could throw some light on the subject it would much oblige
ARTHUR S. MATHER.

Law Association Buildings, 13, Harrington-street,

Liverpool, Oct. 16.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—ED. S. J.]

THE COUNTY OF LONDON.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The Local Government Act, 1888, has in one instance created a state of disorder in conveyancing matters, to which we venture to call your attention.

Section 40, sub-section 1, of the Act enacts that "the metropolis shall on and after the appointed day be an administrative county by the name of the administrative county of London," and sub-section 2 goes on to provide that "such portions of the administrative county of London as form part of the counties of Middlesex, Surrey, and Kent shall be severed from those counties and form a separate county for all non-administrative purposes by the name of the county of London."

It appears to us that the logical result of the above provisions should be that in all deeds and other documents of title, land in the metropolitan parts of the old counties of Middlesex, Surrey, and Kent should be described as situate in the county of London, or (to avoid a difficulty owing to the old county of Middlesex being a register county) as situate "in that part of the county of London which was formerly included in, or formerly constituted part of the county of Middlesex," or as the case may be.

It is worthy of note that both the Middlesex Registry Act, 1891, and the Land Registry (Middlesex Deeds) Act, 1891, totally ignore section 41 of the Local Government Act, 1888, and thus add to the confusion in which the matter is involved.

Owing to this omission it might with some plausibility be argued that no land in the county of London is subject to registration under the Middlesex Registry Act, 1708, and the amending Acts.

The matter we have raised is not, perhaps, of great importance, but the fact that some solicitors use the old nomenclature, and others the new, gives rise to great confusion, and we think you will agree with us that it is desirable to put an end to this confusion by a uniform practice being adopted by solicitors.

C. & E. WOODROFFE.

39, Eastcheap, E.C., October 17.

P.S.—What an opportunity the Land Registry have lost. How simple it would have been to add a short clause to the Land Registry (Middlesex Deeds) Act, providing that inasmuch as part of the old county of Middlesex has been merged in the new county of London (which discards the old boundaries), the jurisdiction of the Land Registry shall, for the purpose of the registration of deeds, be extended to all land situate in the county of London.

[We imagined that the use of the words "county of London" was by this time general.—ED. S. J.]

A POINT OF PRACTICE.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—A curious little point of practice has recently come under my notice, and you may, perhaps, think it worth mention.

In recovering debts between £20 and £50 I was under the impression that one was safe in going to the High Court if the case were such that one could rely on succeeding in an application under order 14, or, in other words, that the only risk was the risk of failing under that order.

It appears, however, that there is another risk, namely, that the defendant may put one to the expense of an order for substituted service, which expense there is no means of recovering.

My case was as follows:—A writ to recover £45 was sent into the country for service. My agent reported that after repeated attempts he had failed to effect service. I instructed him to take further steps, and to send me an affidavit in support of an application for leave to effect substituted service. This was done, and the application was made and granted. The defendant then instructed his solicitors, who called to settle the matter. Not being able to agree the costs, we taxed, and Master Butler held that, there having been no application under order 14, he could only allow the county court costs.

Had the defendant been served in the ordinary way, and without difficulty, the master's decision would not have hurt me, inasmuch as the county court costs were slightly more than the usual costs of a writ, but the result in my case was to disallow entirely the costs of the application for substituted service, including the extra costs paid to the agent and other disbursements in connection with the application.

Assuming the learned master's decision is correct, some slight alteration of the rules seems desirable.

If the defendant had not settled when he did, and I had obtained an order for judgment under order 14, would the master have held that he could only allow the usual costs on such an order? If so, I should still have failed to recover the costs of the substituted service.

W. H. W.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—ED. S. J.]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Before the Vacation Judge.

KITTS v. MOORE & CO.,—17th October.

PRACTICE—INJUNCTION—ARBITRATION PROCEEDING UNDER DISPUTED DOCUMENT—WHETHER COURT WILL RESTRAIN.

This was a motion on behalf of the plaintiff that the defendants might be restrained until the trial of the action or further order from proceeding or attempting to proceed with any arbitration having reference to any disputes between the plaintiff and defendants in respect of a certain cargo of hay or a partnership between the plaintiff and defendants. Upon behalf of the plaintiff it was stated that the defendants were proceeding to arbitration upon a sold note. The plaintiff alleged that that sold note ought not to be acted upon, because it did not represent the true contract between the parties. The plaintiff admitted that if the sold note were the contract entered into by the parties he would have to go to arbitration; but he said it was not the contract. He contended that the true contract was one of partnership. The court had always interfered to stay any proceedings till the trial if such proceedings were inconvenient. Upon behalf of the defendants it was contended that *North London Railway Co. v. Great Northern Railway Co.* (11 Q. B. D. 30) showed that the court would not interfere by injunction in such a case as this.

LORD RUSSELL, C.J.—I think the case of *North London Railway Co. v. Great Northern Railway Co.* is distinguishable. There the proposition was laid down that the court would not peremptorily restrain the defendants from having their claim under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act decided. But that is not this case. This is merely an application to restrain the defendants temporarily from proceeding to arbitration till the rights of the parties are determined. I do not see that any hardship will be indicated by temporarily restraining the arbitration. I make an order in terms of the notice of motion until the trial. The costs will be costs in the action.—COUNSEL, *Martin, Q.C., and P. S. Baker; T. W. Chitty.* SOLICITORS, *Woodard & Hood; Pritchard, Englishfield, & Co.*

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

The death is announced of Mr. CHARLES MARSHALL GRIFFITH, Q.C., Chairman of the Cardiganshire Quarter Sessions, in his sixty-fourth year. He was called to the bar in 1855, and was made a Queen's Counsel in 1877.

APPOINTMENT.

Mr. EDWARD JONES TRUSTRAM, M.A. Oxon., has been elected Vestry Clerk of the Parishes of St. Mary-le-Bow (Cheapside, E.C.) and St. Pancras-le-Soper (Queen-street, E.C.). Mr. Trustram is the parliamentary returning officer of the Borough of Deptford and a partner in the firm of Halse, Trustram, & Co., whose offices have been at 61, Cheapside, for more than a third of a century. Mr. R. C. Halse, the senior partner in the firm, is the Deputy of the Ward of Cheap.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

DISSOLUTIONS.

THOMAS ELLERKER LEWIN, jun., and JOHN BOUCHER EVANS, solicitors (Lewin & Evans), Wool Exchange, Basinghall-street, London. Sept. 29. [Gazette, Oct. 13.]

WILLIAM DAMPIRE JEANS and JOHN GRAY FARRER-MORGAN, solicitors (Jeans & Morgan), Manchester. Sept. 29. [Gazette, Oct. 16.]

GENERAL.

At the Oxfordshire Quarter Sessions this week the vice-chairman, the Earl of Jersey, announced that Mr. Charles Edward Thornhill, who had held the office of chairman for a period of nearly twenty years, had resigned, on the ground of ill-health. Lord Jersey also tendered his own resignation as vice-chairman. Sir William Anson, Warden of All Souls, was appointed chairman, but the question of appointing a vice-chairman was allowed to stand over until the next sessions.

The following are the arrangements made by the judges (Justices Wills and Kennedy) for holding the ensuing autumn assizes on the Northern Circuit—viz., the commissions will be opened at Carlisle on Thursday, October 25; at Lancaster on Monday, October 29; at Manchester on Thursday, November 1; and at Liverpool on Wednesday, November 14. Business will commence at each place on the day next after the commission day at 11 o'clock. There will be no civil business at Carlisle or Lancaster. At Manchester and Liverpool there will be both civil and criminal business. In case all the causes entered for trial at Manchester shall not be finished by the 13th of November, the trial of the remainder will be adjourned until the termination of the assizes at Liverpool, when the judge will return to Manchester on the 29th of November to try the remaining causes and such further causes as may have been entered. The trial of special jury causes will commence at Manchester on Monday, November 5, and at Liverpool on Monday, November 19.

"Solicitor," writing to the *St. James's Gazette* on "The Law Officers and the Chancery Bar," says: A reference to the following table shows that, with the exception of a few months in 1886, both law officers were from the year 1875 to 1892 selected from the common law bar, and during that period the experts in Chancery matters were conspicuous by their absence:—

	ATTORNEY-GENERAL.	SOLICITOR-GENERAL.
1875 to 1880	Sir John Holker	Sir Hardinge Giffard.
1880 to 1885	Sir Henry James	Sir Farrer Herschell.
1885	Sir Richard Webster	Sir J. E. Gorst.
1886, January to July	Sir Charles Russell	Sir Horace Davey.
1886 to 1892	Sir Richard Webster	Sir Edward Clarke.
1892	Sir Charles Russell	Sir J. Rigby.

If the table be carried back it will be found that since the formation of the Gladstone ministry in 1868 both law officers have, with rare exceptions, been selected from the common law bar.

Slater's Detective Association Offices are now at No. 1, Basinghall-street, E.C.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

EDMONDE.—Oct. 10, at 31, Underhill-road, Lordship-lane, Dulwich, S.E., the wife of Oscar Edmonds, solicitor, of a daughter.
INGERS.—Oct. 14, at Springfield, Nightingale-lane, S.W., the wife of Arthur R. Ingers, barrister-at-law, of a son.
IRELAND.—Oct. 15, at Wood Dalling, Hampton Wick, the wife of H. Cubitt Ireland, solicitor, of a daughter.
MANFIELD.—Oct. 12, at the Hasard, Sherringham, the wife of the Hon. John Mansfield, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
STREDWICK.—Oct. 5, at Weston Villas, Thames Ditton, the wife of C. E. Stredwick, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

FERGUSON.—ROBERTSON.—Oct. 11, at Dunard, Downhill, Glasgow, Archd. D. Fergusson, solicitor, Greenock, to Helen, second daughter of W. A. Robertson, of Sandhills, Ayrshire.

HOLT—PARKER.—Oct. 10, at the Old Church, Smethwick, Staffordshire, Alfred Holt, of Elmehurst, Leamington, and of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Florence, eldest daughter of John I. Parker, J.E., of Edgbaston.
MILLAR—A'BEAL.—Oct. 13, at St. Peter's Church, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Ernest Bruce Millar, of 3, Church-court, Old Jewry, London, E.C., solicitor, to Magdalena, only daughter of John A'Beal, of St. Leonards-on-Sea.
NICHOLSON—KIRSOFF.—Oct. 10, at the Abbey Church, Hexham, by the Rev. Canon Barker, J. H. Nicholson, solicitor, Hexham, to Eliza (Ellie), youngest daughter of the late William Kirsoff, solicitor, Hexham.

DEATHS.

GRIFFITH.—Oct. 16, at 31, Hyde-park-square, W., Charles Marshall Griffith, Q.C., of the Inner Temple and Liwyndur, Cardiganshire, aged 63.
MOSS.—Oct. 13, at Zetland Lodge, 274, New Cross-road, S.E., John Thomas Moss, of 38, Gracechurch-street, E.C., solicitor, aged 72.
TOOTELL.—Oct. 16, at 12, Westbourne-gardens, W., C. J. Tootell, of the Central Office, Royal Courts of Justice, London, aged 49. No flowers by request.

OLD AND RARE FIRE INSURANCE POLICIES, &c., wanted to complete a Collection.—Particulars, by letter, to A. R. C., 75, Cheapside, London.—[ADVT.]

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS & LESSORS.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 65, near the Meteorological Office, Victoria-st., Westminster (Estab. 1876), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c.—[ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 12.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

C J FOX & CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 10, directed to be heard on Oct 24 Budd & Co, 24, Austinfriars, solors for petnors Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 23
COLONIAL DEBENTURE CORPORATION, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 11, directed to be heard on Oct 24 Gordon M Folkard, 1, Laurence Pountney hill, solor for the petnors Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 23
EASTERN MORNING NEWS CO., LIMITED.—Creditors of the old company are required, on or before Nov 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims accruing due up to Oct 1, 1894, to William Saunders Hunt, 42, Whitefriargate, Hull
GRETA COLLIERIES, LIMITED.—By an order made by the Lord Chief Justice, dated the 2nd day of October, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the Collieries be continued. Blyth & Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st., solors for the petitioners
ST. IVES (CORNWALL) GAS CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Aug. 15, directed to be heard on the 24th day of October. Frederick Bradley, 75, Mark lane, solor and petitioner in person. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct. 23
WILLIAM LEVETT & CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Oct. 9, directed to be heard on Oct. 24. Kennedy & Co, 1, Cannon's inn, Strand, solors for the company. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct. 23
WOODSTOCK MILL SPINNING CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 5, directed to be heard at the Assize Courts, Strangeways, Manchester, on Tuesday, Oct 30. Ponsoby & Carlile, 5, Clegg-street, Oldham, solors for petnors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 16.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CROUCH & JAY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Robinson, 115, Maroon-street, Limehouse, E. Bradshaw, East India Dock rd, Poplar, solor for liquidator
DEFLECTOR SAFETY LAMP AND MIXER'S APPLIANCE CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 19, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Kerr, 14A, Faulkner st, Manchester
SCORDALE LEAD MINES SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Batty, 16, St Winchester st
WHITELEAF STEAMSHIP CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Oct 12, directed to be heard on Oct 24. Flux & Leadbitter, 144, Leadenhall st, solors for the petnors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 23
YORK STREET PUBLISHING CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented Aug 30, directed to be heard on Oct 24. Plesse & Son, 15, Old Jewry chambers, solors for petnors Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 23

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 5.

AIRD, JAMES, Wigton, Cumberland, Gent Oct 27 Richardson & Crookes, Wigton
BAKER, LOUISE, W Bowling Oct 26 Paget, Skipton
BEARD, WILLIAM, Lincoln, Esq Nov 6 Danby & Son, Lincoln
BOYD, JAMES, Kensington, Esq Dec 1 Braund & Co, Furnival's inn
BRADLEY, JOHN, Rainow, Chester, Shoemaker Nov 27 Hand, Macclesfield
BROUGHTON, GEORGE, Westminster, Gent Nov 12 Trollope & Winchworth, Westminster
DAVIES, DAVID, Maesteg, Glam, Pattern Maker Nov 5 Morgan, Cardiff
DAVIES, ELIZA, Plymouth Nov 6 Fox, Plymouth
DAY, ELIZA SELINA, Camberwell Nov 17 Hughes & Masterman, New Broad st
ELKE, JOSEPH, Shirley, Warwick, Miller Oct 31 King & Ludlow, Solihull
FISHER, THOMAS, Stechford, Licensed Victualler Nov 29 Blackham & Taylor, Birmingham
FLURRY, ELLEN, Clapton Nov 12 Marsh, Fenchurch st
GIBBS, JOSEPH, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer Nov 20 Hemman & Son, Northampton
GREENSLADE, WILLIAM AMBROSE, Warwick Nov 5 Hubbard, Chancery lane
HAINES, SAMUEL, Hornsey, Oil and Colourman Dec 1 Brown, Seething lane
HARRIE, DAVID, Brighton, Gent Nov 10 Hutton, Strand

HAWES, JONATHAN, Hotby rise, Gent Nov 19 May, Golden sq
LAURANCE, ADOLPHUS ALEXANDER, Baywater, Physician Nov 14 Field & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
MALIPHANT, HENRY, Swansea, Printer Nov 1 Seline, Swansea
MASON, THOMAS, Hebden Bridge, Contractor Nov 9 Shaw, Hebden Bridge
MATLEY, JANE, Dukinfield Nov 17 Darnton & Bottomley, Ashton under Lyne
MURCOTT, JOHN JOSEPH, Whitnash, Farmer Dec 1 Handley & Co, Warwick
PARKES, DOUGLAS GORDON, Taiping, Perak, Civil Servant Jan 1 Taylor & Co, Gray's inn
PLAXTON, JAMES, Kingston upon Hull, Printer Oct 17 Jacobs & Dixon, Hull
ROFF, SAMUEL DRURY, Hampstead, Builder Nov 10 Lawford, Coleman st
ROOKER, JOHN MELCHISEDDEC, St Stephens by Saltash, Gent Dec 10 Elworthy & Co, Plymouth
SAUNDERS, SARAH, Huntspill Nov 13 Bishop, Bridgwater
SHARP, RICHARD, Kennington, Tax Collector Nov 1 Carter & Bell, Eastcheap
SISON, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Gent Nov 1 Eaton, Sheffield
SPREE, ALFRED MILES, Park cment, Esq Nov 1 Geare & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
STEWART, JOHN, Stanningfield, Gent Oct 30 Partridge & Wilson, Bury St Edmunds
STEWART, WILLIAM, Bury St Edmunds, Farmer Oct 30 Partridge & Wilson, Bury St Edmunds
STOKES, ANN, Cardiff Nov 5 Morgan, Cardiff
WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Ynyshir, Glam, Shoemaker Jan 1 Williams, Aberdare

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 9.

BATH, TETPHERA, Brixton Nov 6 Grundy & Co, Queen Victoria st
BAYLEY, JOHN, Silverdale, Gent Nov 7 Boddington & Bell, Manchester
BESWICK, MARY, Rochdale Nov 11 Molesworth & Mattley, Rochdale
BISHOP, MARY EMILY, Heavitree Nov 17 Bremridge & Luke, Exeter
BOOTH, THOMAS, Waterloot, Gent Oct 31 Knowles & Thompson, Manchester
BREBTON, ROBERT PEARSON, Gloucester tyce Nov 10 Carr, High Holborn
BULSTRODE, GEORGINA, Worthington, Leeds Nov 12 Smith & Co, Ashby de la Zouch
CARLETON, MARIA ANN GIBOUX, Gipsy hill Nov 10 Martin & Nicholson, Queen st
COCK, HANNAH, Hammersmith Nov 6 Rawlings, Walbrook
CROWTHER, JOHN WILLIAM, Hyde, Cheshire Nov 1 Robinson & Sons, Blackburn
DEAT, THOMAS, SHAP, Stonemason Oct 27 Oldham & Marsh, Melton Mowbray
EDDIE, MARIANNE, Lincoln Nov 17 H E & R Mason, Barton upon Humber
FORD, CHARLES FREDERICK, Stamford hill, Civil Servant Nov 10 Vanderpump & Son, Gray's inn sq
FORD, ELIZABETH MARIA, Ilford Nov 10 Vanderpump & Son, Gray's inn sq
GIBBS, JOSEPH, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer Nov 20 Hensman & Son, Northampton
GREEN, GEORGE, Preston, Gent Nov 3 Craven, Preston
GREY, CLARA LOUISA, Reading Nov 3 Beale & Martin, Reading
HANNAH, JOHN, Corby, Licensed Victualler Nov 21 Beaumont, Grantham
HOLFORD, SUSAN MARY BASKERVILLE, Petersham Nov 6 Leman & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
JACKSON, ROBERT WARD Nov 11 Doss & Thompson, Newcastle upon Tyne
JEBBOULT, HENRY POUNDBERRY, Exeter, Glass Merchant Nov 15 Jebboul, Carey st
JENKINS, JOHN, Exeter, Smith Oct 22 Friend & Beal, Exeter
LANGDON, JOHN BROWN, Torrington, Dairyman Nov 6 Matthews, Torrington
LARGE, GEORGE FREDERICK, Manchester, Publican Oct 31 Crofton & Craven, Manchester
PARKES, DOUGLAS GORDON, Taiping, Perak, Civil Servant Jan 1 Taylor & Co, Gray's inn
PILKINGTON, RICHARD, Penzance, Gent Nov 3 Brewis, St Helens
PIPER, HENRY THOMAS, Peckham, Gent Nov 20 Pettitt, King's Arms Yard
POPPLEWELL, EMILY, Kingston upon Hull Sept 27 Gale, Hull
RAYMOND, HENRY, Bournemouth, Dealer in China Oct 22 H S & S Watts, Yeovil
STEPHENSON, JAMES, Padiham, Tailor Nov 16 Waddington, Burnley
STEPHENS, YOLANDE MARIE LOUISE LYNE, Roehampton Nov 17 Tatham & Pym, Old Jewry
STEVENSON, JOHN, Warwick, Gent Dec 1 Handley & Co, Warwick
WALLWORK, ALICE, Poulton le Fylde Nov 10 W A & R Ascroft, Preston
WORSWELL, ARTHUR GEORGE, Blindley Heath, Godstone, Hotel Keeper Nov 20 Pearless & Sons, East Grinstead

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 13.

ARBOUR, MARY, Leicester Nov 20 Burgess & Dexter, Leicester
BRIGHTWELL, THOMAS HENRY, Byfield, Farmer Nov 15 Willoughby, Daventry
BROOKER, ANNE ELIZABETH, Bournemouth, Hants Oct 31 Fussell & Co, Bristol
BRYSON, GEORGE, Langley Moor, Farm Labourer Nov 8 Bell & Sons, Sunderland

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 12.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMSON, JACKSON, Loftus in Cleveland, Retired Shoemaker Stockton on Tees Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 5
AKSTER, WILLIAM HOPKIN, Fulham rd, Electrician High Court Pet Sept 26 Ord Oct 8
ALLEN, JOHN, East Dereham, Merchant Norwich Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
ANSTWY, FRANK, Sutton, Surrey, Clerk Croydon Pet Aug 24 Ord Oct 9
BAGGALL, JOSEPH, Hackney rd, Brushmaker High Court Pet Sept 20 Ord Oct 8
BARKER, CHARLES FREDERICK JAMES, Hampstead, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Sept 4 Ord Oct 8
BARKER, EDWIN TUMSON, Leeds, Solicitor Leeds Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
BINGHAM, WILLIAM, Thringstone, Labourer Burton on Trent Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
BRACE, ROSE JANE, East Grinstead, Dairy Proprietress Tunbridge Wells Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4

BROWN, HERBERT, Blackburn, Draper's Assistant Blackburn Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
CHEVERELL, CHARLES, Homerton, Builder High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Oct 8
CLIMENTS, RICHARD, Exeter, Confectioner Exeter Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
COLLARD, THOMAS LOUIS, Nackington, Farmer Canterbury Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
EDWARDS, ROBERT, Penrhynedeudraeth, Painter Portmadoc Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
EDWARDS, WILLIAM GEORGE, St Neot, Cattle Dealer Plymouth Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
FRENCH, WILLIAM STEPHEN, Winchester, Clerk in Holy Orders Winchester Pet Sept 15 Ord Oct 8
FURBY, JOHN FREDERICK, Oxford, Tailor Oxford Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
GADE, PETER, Bristol, Public house Broker Bristol Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 8
GIBSON, JOHN, West Hartlepool, Builder Sunderland Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
GIBSON, GEORGE WILLIAM, Kidderminster, Innkeeper Kidderminster Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
GOLDING, JAMES, Twyford, Draper Reading Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6

HALL, HENRY GARRETT, Stourport, Carriage Builder Kidderminster Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
HOWELLS, JOHN, Whitland, Merchant Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 27 Ord Oct 10
ISAAC, CHARLES JOHN, Loughborough, Provision Merchant Leicester Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 8
KOLBOMER, WILLIAM, Manchester, Furniture Dealer Manchester Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
LAMPARD, JAMES, Bristol, Jeweller Bristol Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
LEWIS, JAMES, Erith, Clothier Rochester Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
LORD, FREDERICK, Scarborough, Game Dealer Scarborough Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
MARSH, WILLIAM, Rugeon, Pawnbroker Warrington Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
MAYES, WILLIAM, Derby, Builder Derby Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
MOORE, FRED, Tonypandy, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
MORRIS, ANNA, Brecon, Glass Dealer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
NORTON, EDWIN JAMES, Shaftesbury, Plumber Salisbury Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9

CHADWICK, JOSEPH, Oldham, Gent Oct 29 Taylor, Oldham
COOPER, CHARLES BRIMLEY, Sandy, Market Gardener Nov 24 Leeds Smith, Sandy
CORNEY, MARTHA, Liverpool Nov 12 Neale, Liverpool
CUTTS, HENRY, King's Norton, Licensed Victualler Nov 27 Coley & Coley, Birmingham
GRAHAM, ELIZABETH, Sunderland Oct 31 Burnicle, Sunderland
GRAHAM, THOMAS, Sunderland, Joiner Oct 31 Burnicle, Sunderland
HAWKINS, WILLIAM BENTINCK LETHAM, Bryanston sq, Clerk in Holy Orders Nov 28 Cunliffe & Davenport, Chancery lane
HIPPLEY, Admiral HENRY NELSON, Pall Mall Dec 15 Lawrence & Co, New sq
JACKSON, THOMAS, Tillingham, Farmer Nov 30 Jackson, Finsbury pavement
JOHNSON, SARAH, Dalston, Dairy Keeper Nov 8 Bastard, Philpot lane
JONES, SARAH, Blaenavon Dec 12 Bythway & Son, Pontypool
MCCLURE, ANDREW WALLACE, Leeds, Licensed Victualler Nov 17 McConnell, Leeds
MEYNIER, ELIZA MARY, Ramsgate Dec 1 Handley & Co, Warwick
MORT, WILLIAM, Southport, Doctor Nov 30 Buck & Co, Southport
NISSEN, JOHN LEIGH, Streatham Nov 12 Bridgman & Willcocks, College hill
ORDE, ANNA MARIA FENN, Bath Nov 26 Farrer & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
PHILLIPS, EDWARD, Bristol, Furniture Broker Nov 6 Perham, Bristol
PUEBRICK, SUSAN, Oxford Nov 10 Galpin, Oxford
RECHBERG, COUNTESS DE, Ebury st Sept 25 Gidney, Aulseham
ROBINSON, JOSEPH, Clifton Keynes, Esq Oct 29 Sharman & Trethewy, Bedford
ROBINSON, MARY ANN WHITWORTH, Olney Oct 29 Sharman & Trethewy, Bedford
RODGERS, ANN, Sheffield Nov 10 Clegg & Sons, Sheffield
SCROFIELD, CATHERINE, Manchester Nov 16 Lee & Co, Manchester
STUART, ROBERT FRINGLE, Tunbridge Wells, Esq Nov 30 Trinder & Capron, Cornhill
TURNER, JOSEPH, Millbank, Publican Nov 10 Gamlen & Burdett, Gray's inn sq
TUDOR, ELIZABETH, Malvern Oct 30 Shakespeare & Co, Birmingham
WAINWRIGHT, AGNES OCTAVIA, Maidstone Nov 21 Wood, Finsbury circus
WALTER, DAVID, Rotherfield, Sussex, Farmer Nov 23 Andrew & Cheale, Tunbridge Wells
WAKELING, MARY ANNE, Kidderminster Nov 14 Talbot, Kidderminster
WILDE, MARY ELIZABETH, Birmingham Nov 12 Snow & Atkins, Birmingham
WORTHINGTON, BEATRICE, Hastings Dec 1 Tomlin & Son, Old Burlington st

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 16.

BARNES, SAMUEL, Exeter, Gent Nov 15 Caprons & Co, Conduit st
BOWE, GEORGE DAY, Huntspill, Somerset, Farmer Nov 17 J Ruscombe Poole & Son, Bridgwater
BROWN, PETER, Shotley Bridge, Chemist Nov 10 Booth, Shotley Bridge
BURGESS, JOHN, Gt Grimsby Nov 19 Barker, Gt Grimsby
CURRIE, MARGARET, W Burton Dec 8 Gadaden & Treherne, Bedford row
CUTT, WILLIAM, Hattogate, Esq Oct 27 Lupton & Fawcett, Leeds
DAUNCEY, WALTER, Birmingham Nov 12 Ansell & Ashford, Birmingham
DAWSON, JOSEPH, Broughton in Furness, Yeoman Nov 20 Butler, Broughton in Furness
FAIRBROTHER, JAMES, Hyde, Builder Dec 20 Hibbert & Westbrook, Hyde
FISHER, WILLIAM RICHARD, Gt Grimsby, Machine Dealer Oct 25 Wilkin, Gt Grimsby
FOSTER, JAMES, Leeds, Cutler Nov 20 Simpsons & Denham, Leeds
GREENWOOD, THOMAS, Manchester, Packer Oct 13 Lloyd & Davies, Manchester
HARDING, ADELINE ELLEN ELIZA, Lymington Dec 11 Wynne & Son, Lincoln's inn fields
HARTLEY, WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS, Camborne Nov 12 Smith & Co, Finsbury circus
HATTON, SAMUEL, Birmingham, Safe Maker Nov 15 Smith & Co, Birmingham
LINWOOD, JOHN, Mayfair, Groom Nov 10 Taylor & Taylor, New Broad st
LLOYD, EVAN WILLIAM, Newton Nottage, Minister Nov 24 James, Merthyr Tydfil
MREGITT, ZILLAN, Sheffield Nov 30 Burdekin & Co, Sheffield
MORRIS, JOHN EDWARD, Wolverhampton Nov 17 Willcock & Taylor, Wolverhampton
PEARCE, WALTER MASSIE, Gt Crosby, Cotton Salesman Dec 23 White, Liverpool
POTTER, JOHN, Kensington Jan 1 Merriman & Co, Austinfrans
RUSSELL, WILLIAM, Wallsend Nov 30 Stanton & Atkinson, Newcastle upon Tyne
SIMPSON, JOHN HUGH, Oughttrington, Chester, Farmer Nov 12 Laycock, Altrincham
THOMAS, ALAN BRODERICK, Woking, Captain Nov 30 Wynne & Son, Lincoln's inn fields
THORBURN, ANDREW, Newcastle upon Tyne, Draper Dec 10 Stobo & Livingston, Newcastle upon Tyne
WATSON, REGINALD ERNEST, South Benfleet, Gent Jan 1 Miller, Tokenhouse bldgs
WRIGHT, WILLIAM, Gt Yarmouth, Builder Nov 30 Culley, Norwich

POLLITT, ARTHUR, Mirfield, Yorks, Joiner Dewsbury Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 REES, JOHN, Bridgewater, Boot Dealer Bridgewater Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 REES, WILLIAM MATTHEW, Cwmwria, Licensed Victualler Swansea Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 ROLANDO, HENRY GEORGE, Sudbury, Suffolk, Fishmonger Colchester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 SHARP, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Ironmonger Birmingham Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 SLADDIN, JOSEPH, Halifax, Hairdresser Halifax Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 SMITHURST, G., Addiscombe Croydon Pet July 30 Ord Oct 9
 STEVENSON, ARTHUR, Nottingham, Fruit Salesman Nottingham Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 THOMAS, ALAN, NOEL, Tottenham, Traveller Edmonton Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 THOMAS, THOMAS WATKIN, Treherria, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 8
 VERNON, COURTNEY ROBERT PERCY, Stanwick, Nurseryman Northampton Pet Sept 15 Ord Oct 9
 WALLER, MORRIS, Charterhouse st High Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 WAINLEY, JAMES, Bradford, Grocer Bradford Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 WOODWARD, CHARLY JOHN, Rochester, Farmer Rochester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10

FIRST MEETINGS.

BACKHOUSE, AMBROSE, Manchester, Merchant Oct 19 at 3
 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 BAZLEY, JOHN, Leominster, Veterinary Surgeon Oct 23 at 2.30 2, Offa st, Hereford
 BROADBENT, JAMES, Calverley, Grocer Oct 20 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 CLARKE, ORMOND BLACKWAT, Wetherall, Cumb, Gentleman Oct 23 at 12 12, Lonsdale st, Carlisle
 CLEMENTS, RICHARD, Exeter, Confectioner Oct 23 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circle, Exeter
 COLBORNE, HENRY, Stoke Golding, Farmer Oct 19 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 COOK, FRANK, Longton, House Furnisher Oct 31 at 12.30 North Stafford Hotel, Stoke upon Trent
 DANKER, JAMES, Kidderminster, Licensed Victualler Oct 19 at 2 A 8 Thurnfield, Solicitor, Kidderminster
 DEAN, JOHN, Beckenham, Coachbuilder Oct 19 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
 DIAPER, ALFRED, Eokington, Market Gardener Oct 19 at 11 Off Rec, 45, Copenhagen st, Worcester
 EVANS, DAVID, Duketown, Brecon, Carpenter Oct 19 at 3 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 FRANKLIN, GEORGE, Middlestown, Yorks, Yarn Spinner Oct 19 at 11 Off Rec, Bond terrace, Wakefield
 GETHIN, WILLIAM, Leominster, Tailor Oct 22 at 10 4, Corn sq, Leominster
 GLANTZ, ISAAC, Cable st, Provision Merchant Oct 19 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 GROVER, SYDNEY, South st, Timber Merchant Oct 19 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HALL, BENJAMIN, Netherthorn, Builder Oct 19 at 10.15 Off Rec, Dudley
 HOWE, ARTHUR, Chatteris, Cambs, Farmer Oct 30 at 12 Law Courts, New rd, Peterborough
 HYDE, ALFRED, Kidderminster, Licensed Victualler Oct 19 at 2.30 A 8 Thurnfield, Solicitor, Kidderminster
 KIRBY, ALFRED FRANCIS PHILIP, Watford, Clerk Oct 19 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 LEWIS, JAMES, Erith, Clothier Oct 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, High st, Rochester
 LEYBOURN, FLORENCE, Regent's pk, Music Hall Performer Oct 19 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 LORD, HERBERT MOODY, Dudley, Licensed Victualler Oct 19 at 10.40 Off Rec, Dudley
 MANERO, ANTONIO, Walton-on-Thames, Restaurant Keeper Oct 22 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MARPLE, JOHN, Treherria, Glam, Ch-mist Oct 22 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 MATTHEWS, EDWARD, Woodstock, Saddler Oct 19 at 12 Off Rec, Oxford
 MORTIMER, DAVID, Bradford, Retired Butcher Oct 19 at 3 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 PICKUP, SAMUEL, Beccles, Auctioneer Agent Oct 19 at 3.30 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 PUNFIELD, ARTHUR, Wednesfield, Staffs, Builder Oct 22 at 11.30 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
 ROLANDO, HENRY GEORGE, Sudbury, Fishmonger Oct 25 at 12.45 Townhall, Colchester
 REES, JOHN HIGGINS, Swansea, Lockgatemant Oct 19 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 SAKNY, JOSEPH, Wokingham, Tailor Oct 19 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Temple chmbrs, Temple avenue
 SLADDIN, JOSEPH, Halifax, Hairdresser's Assistant Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax
 SMITH, RICHARD, Liverpool, Chandler Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 SMITH, WALTER FREDERICK, and SAMUEL HARTOGS, Shore-ditch, Embroid Cloth Makers Oct 19 at 3.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 SOUTHWOOD, ALFRED, Fareham Oct 22 at 12.30 Messrs Young & Son, Bank bldgs, Hastings
 STRIMMANN, ERNEST E, Ginn, Salop, Farmer Oct 23 at 3 2, Offa st, Hereford
 TAIT, WILLIAM EDGAR, Croydon, Clerk Oct 23 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
 THOMAS, GEORGE, Bolton, Lodging house Keeper, Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge Junction, High st, Portsmouth
 TURNER, RICHARD, Tipton, Public house Manager Oct 19 at 10 Off Rec, Dudley
 WALTERS, DANIEL, Ynyssywl, Glam, Underground Haulier Oct 19 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 WATTS, GEORGE, Bolton, Watchmaker Oct 19 at 11 10, Wood st, Bolton
 WOODWARD, CHARLY JOHN, Rochester, Farmer Oct 29 at 12 Off Rec, High st, Rochester

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMSON, JACKSON, Loftus in Cleveland, Shoemaker Mid-dleborough Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 5

ALLEN, JOHN, East Dereham, Merchant Norwich Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 BARKER, EDWIN THOMSON, Leeds, Solicitor Leeds Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
 BINGHAM, WILLIAM, Thringstone, Labourer Burton on Trent Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 BRACE, ROSE JANE, East Grinstead, Dairy Proprietress Tunbridge Wells Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 10
 BROWN, HERBERT, Blackburn, Draper's Assistant Blackburn Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 8
 BROWN, MARTHA, Batley, Hay Dealer Dewsbury Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 8
 CLEMENTS, RICHARD, Exeter, Confectioner Exeter Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 COGOINS, GEORGE, Llanrothal, Rabbit Warren Keeper Newport, Mon Pet Aug 24 Ord Oct 8
 COOK, FRANK, Longton, House Furnisher Stoke upon Trent Pet Sept 7 Ord Oct 10
 COURENS, EDWARD HENRY, Regent's Park High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 6
 EDWARDS, ROBERT, Penryn, Painter Portmadoc Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 9
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM GEORGE, St Neot, Cattle Dealer Plymouth Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 FURBY, JOHN FREDERICK, Oxford, Tailor Oxford Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 GIBBONS, GEORGE WILLIAM, Kidderminster, Innkeeper Kidderminster Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
 GIBSON, JOHN, West Hartlepool, Joiner Sunderland Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 10
 GOLDING, JAMES, Twyford, Berks, Draper Reading Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
 HALL, HENRY GABRIEL, Stourport, Carriage Builder Kidderminster Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 JOHNSON, EDWARD, Westminster, Consulting Engineer High Court Pet July 31 Ord Oct 6
 KOLMER, WILLIAM, Manchester, Furniture Dealer Manchester Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 LEWIS, JAMES, Erith, Clothier Rochester Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 LORD, FREDERICK, Scarborough, Fish Dealer Scarborough Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 MARSH, WILLIAM, Warrington, Pawnbroker Warrington Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 MAYES, WILLIAM, Derby, Builder Derby Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 MOORE, FRED, Tonypandy, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 MORRIS, ANNA, Brecon, Glass Dealer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
 NORTON, EDWIN JAMES, Shaftesbury, Plumber Salisbury Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 PAYNE, JAMES ALFRED, Plaistow, Barman High Court Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 6
 POLLITT, ARTHUR, Mirfield, Joiner Dewsbury Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 RANBY, JAMES HOLMES, Ashby, Linc, Draper Lincoln Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 8
 REED, JOHN, Bridgewater, Bootdealer Bridgewater Pet Oct Ord Oct 9
 REES, WILLIAM MATTHEW, Cwmwria, Licensed Victualler Swansea Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 ROBINSON, JACOB, Blaenavon, Furniture Dealer Tredgar Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 6
 ROLANDO, HENRY GEORGE, Sudbury, Suffolk, Fishmonger Colchester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 SAUVY, AUGUSTE, Turmill st, Engstaver High Court Pet Aug 25 Ord Oct 6
 SLADDIN, JOSEPH, Halifax, Hairdresser Halifax Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 STEVENSON, ARTHUR, Nottingham, Fish Salesman Nottingham Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 WALMSLEY, JAMES, Bradford, Grocer Bradford Pet Oct Ord Oct 10
 WHEELER, JOHN, and JOHN HENRY WHEELER, Kinross, Duxet, Gasfitters Poole Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 9
 WOODWARD, CHARLY JOHN, Rochester, Farmer Rochester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 16.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ANDREW, ALBERT EDWARD, Rochester, Hairdresser Rochester Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 ARMITAGE, CHARLES S, Buxton Stockport Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 11
 ASHFIELD, JESSE, Bromsgrove, Baker Worcester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 BERG, JOHN, Hackney rd, Cabinet Maker High Court Pet Sept 21 Ord Oct 13
 BINNEY, CHARLES HIBBERT, Snaresbrooke, Wharfinger High Court Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 BOOCOCK, JOHN, Leeds, Poultry Dealer Leeds Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 BOWSON, WILLIAM, Leicester, Grocer Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 CLAY, RO, & SONS, Dewsbury, Wool Merchants Dewsbury Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 10
 DRUMMOND, MALCOLM H, Ajaccio, Corsica High Court Pet June 21 Ord Oct 12
 EALEY, JOHN, Rushdon, Grocer Northampton Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 EMMET, WILLIAM HENRY, Reading, Timekeeper Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 FREEMAN, MARIA HANNAH, Norwich, General Shop Keeper Norwich Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 HARRIS, JAMES PETER JAMES, Kennington, Commission Agent High Court Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 12
 HARRIS, JOHN RICHARD, Chipping Campden, Licensed Victualler Kidderminster Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HURL, CHARLES READ, Southwark, Builder High Court Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 ILLINGWORTH, SOPHIA, Fairburn, York, Innkeeper Wakefield Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 JAMES, JOHN, Caron, Labourer Carmarthen Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 JOHNSON, WILLIAM WALTER, Leeds, Blacksmith Leeds Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JURY, STEPHEN JOHN, Leicester, Commission Agent Leicester Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11

KERRHAW, PERCY BEERSFORD WRIGHT, South Hampstead, Lithographer High Court Pet July 13 Ord Oct 13
 KING, GEORGE EDWARD, Weymouth, Farmer Northampton Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 MASON, GEORGE WILLIAM, Macclesfield, Silk Manufacturer Macclesfield Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 MERRIDITH, JOHN RICHARD, Pontypridd, Draper Pontypridd Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 MILLA, JOHN, Leicester, Baker Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 NICHOLSON, THOMAS, Regent st, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 PULLIN, BENJAMIN, Lewisham Park, Insurance Broker Greenwich Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 REES, EVAN, Caerphilly, Butcher Cardiff Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 RIX, SPRINGER, Norfolk, Corn Factor Norwich Pet Sept 25 Ord Oct 12
 ROBERTS, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Chesterton grdns, Colonel High Court Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 6
 RYAN, WILLIAM EDMUND PATRICK, Hammersmith, Clerk High Court Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 SCHOFIELD, JAMES, Hollinwood, Commission Agent Oldham Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 STONE, JAMES, Peckham, Stonemason High Court Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 TACAGNI, PIERO, Brixton High Court Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 TAYLOR, CHARLES, Sandhurst, Laundryman Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 TURNER, JOHN, Leicester, Carpenter Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 UNDERWOOD & TOLKIE, Fore st, Hosiers High Court Pet Sept 22 Ord Oct 11
 WADE, NED, Farsley, Yorks, Coal Merchant Bradford Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 WALL, CHARLES CLIFFORD, Worcester, Baker Worcester Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 WALSH, HENRY, Stoke upon Trent Stoke upon Trent Pet Sept 13 Ord Oct 12
 WIDDOWSON, JOSEPH, Hathers, Framework Knitter Leicester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 WILSON, HERBERT FISHER, Halifax, Builder Halifax Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 WILSON, THOMAS STANLEY, Fallowfield, Cardroom Jobber Oldham Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 WITTEBS, JOSEPH, Caledonian rd, Butcher High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 11
 WRIGHT, GEORGE, Solney, Derby, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALLEN, JOHN, East Dereham, Merchant Oct 27 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 ANDREW, ALBERT EDWARD, Rochester, Hairdresser Oct 29 at 11 Off Rec, Rochester
 ATKINSON, GEORGE ROBINSON, Newcastle on Tyne, Butcher Oct 29 at 11.30 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 BICKERDIE, JOHN THOMPSON, Leeds, Milk Dealer Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 BINGHAM, WILLIAM, Thringstone, Labourer Oct 23 at 2.30 Off Rec, St James's chmbrs, Derby
 BROWN, HERBERT, Blackburn, Draper Nov 7 at 2 County House, Blackburn
 BOURN, WILLIAM, Leicester, Shoemaker Oct 24 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 CLAY, R O, & SONS, Dewsbury, Wool Merchants Oct 24 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Batley
 CLEMENTS, CHRISTOPHER, Aberavon, Wheelwright Oct 23 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 COOK, FRANK, Longton, House Furnisher Oct 25 at 12 White Hart Hotel, Romford
 COWPER, JESSE MARY, Widow Oct 23 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 CRANE, JAMES, Stoke Newington, Builder Oct 24 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbrs, Temple avenue
 EATON, EDWARD, Tooting, Butcher Oct 23 at 12 24, Railway app, London Bridge
 EDWARDS, ROBERT, Penryn, Painter Oct 24 at 1.30 Crypt chmbrs, Chester
 EDWARDS, WILLIAM GEORGE, St Neot, Cattle Dealer Oct 26 at 11 10, Atheneum ter, Plymouth
 FAULKNER, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Stationer Oct 25 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 FURBER, JOHN FREDERICK, Oxford, Tailor Oct 23 at 12 Off Rec, Oxford
 GAGE, PETER, Bristol, Public House Broker Oct 24 at 1 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol
 HOWES, HENRY CHARLES, Lee, Provision Agent Oct 24 at 19 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HURL, CHARLES READ, Southwark, Builder Oct 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 ILLINGWORTH, SOPHIA, Fairburn, York, Innkeeper Oct 23 at 11 Off Rec, Bond ter, Wakefield
 ISAAC, CHARLES JOHN, Loughborough, Provision Merchant Oct 23 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 LAMPARD, JAMES, Bristol, Jeweller Oct 24 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol
 LEWIS, DAVID, Llandisilio, Farmer Oct 23 at 11 Off Rec, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen
 LORD, FREDERICK, Scarborough, Game Dealer Oct 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
 MAYES, WILLIAM, Derby, Builder Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, St James's chmbrs, Derby
 MONTAGNON, LOUIS WILLIAM, Cheltenham, Tutor Oct 23 at 4 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
 NEW, HERBERT, Evesham, Solicitor Oct 23 at 11 Off Rec, 46, Copenhagen row, Worcester
 POLLITT, ARTHUR, Mirfield, Joiner Oct 23 at 11 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Batley
 REED, JOHN, Bridgewater, Boot Dealer Oct 24 at 10.45 Mr. Tamiyn, Auctioneer, High st, Bridgewater
 REID, JAMES, Burnley, Painter Nov 23 at 1.30 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley

ROBERTS, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Kensington, Colonel Oct 23 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
 ROBINSON, JACOB, Blaenavon, Jeweller Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, 45, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 SHARP, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Ironmonger Oct 23 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 SIMPSON, GEORGE, Nicholaston, Cardale, Draper Oct 25 at 2.30 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 SPARGO, NICHOLAS, Llanyrdydilad, Gent Oct 26 at 1.30 George Hotel, Holyhead
 STEPHENS, RICHARD, Clevedon, Engineer Oct 24 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol
 STEVENSON, THOMAS, Preston, Draper's Assistant Nov 16 at 3 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 TETLOW, JOHN, and GEORGE NAYLOR TETLOW, Hyde, Mineral Water Manufacturers Oct 29 at 3 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 THOMAS, JOHN HUXLEY, Llanberis, Quarryman Oct 23 at 3 Prince of Wales Hotel, Carnarvon
 TURNER, JOHN, North Evington, Carpenter Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Herdridge st, Leicester
 WALKER, MORRIS, Charterhouse st Oct 25 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
 WELLS, J ANDERSON, Strawberry Hill, Stockbroker Oct 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at
 WHEELER, JOHN, and JOHN HENRY WHEELER, Kinson, Gas Fitters Oct 23 at 12.30 Off Rec, Salisbury
 WIDDOWSON, JOSEPH, Hathern, Framework Knitter Oct 23 at 1 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Leicester
 WILSON, HERBERT FISHER, Halifax, Builder Oct 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax
 The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of sept 25 :-
 PERL, EDMUND, 86 James's, Inspector of Police Oct 24 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at

ADJUDICATIONS.

ANDREW, ALBERT EDWARD, Rochester, Hairdresser Rochester Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 ASHFIELD, JESSE, Bromsgrove, Nailmaker Worcester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 BOOCOCK, JOHN, Bramley, Yorks, Poultry Dealer Leeds Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
 BURROWS, WILLIAM, Leicester, Shoe Maker Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 COLLARD, THOMAS LOUIS, Nactington, Kent, Farmer Canterbury Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 11
 EALBY, JOHN, Rushden, Grocer Northampton Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 13
 EMERY, WILLIAM HENRY, Reading, Timekeeper Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 EVANS, ERNEST THOMSON RARMBACH, Temple avenue, Medical Practitioner High Court Pet Aug 30 Ord Oct 11
 FIELD, GEORGE HARDING, Clapton park, Builder High Court Pet June 29 Ord Oct 11
 FREEMAN, MARIA HANFAN, Norwich, General Shop Keeper Norwich Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 13
 GLATZ, ISAAC, Cable st, Provision Merchant High Court Pet Sept 26 Ord Oct 12
 HARRIS, JOHN RICHARD, Chipping Campden, Beerhouse Keeper Kidderminster Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HOARE, ALBERT JOSEPH, Camberwell, Agent Edmonton Pet Aug 22 Ord Oct 10
 HOLDSWORTH, JOHN EDWARD, and SAM BOTTOMLEY, Yeading, Merchants Bradford Pet Sept 22 Ord Oct 12
 ILLINGWORTH, SOPHIA, Fairburn, Yorks, Innkeeper Wakefield Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 JAMES, JOHN, Caron, Labourer Carmarthen Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 11
 JOHNSON, WILLIAM WALTER, Leeds, Blacksmith Leeds Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JUST, STEPHEN JOHN, Leicester, Commission Agent Leicester Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 KING, GEORGE EDWARD, Wavendon, Farmer Northampton Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 LYCETT, ARTHUR CHARLES, Worthington, Draper Cocker-mouth Pet June 23 Ord Oct 12
 MASON, GEORGE WILLIAM, Macledfield, Silk Manufacturer Macledfield Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 13
 McQUEEN, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Colchester, China Dealer Colchester Pet Sept 23 Ord Oct 12
 MEREDITH, JOHN RICHARD, Pontypriid, Draper Pontypriid Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 MILLS, JOHN, Leicester, Baker Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 NICHOLSON, THOMAS, Regent st, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 POLLARD, FRANCIS, Pepperstock, Farmer St Albans Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 10
 ULLIN, BENJAMIN, Lowisham Park, Insurance Broker P Greenwich Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 12
 RIX, SPENCER, Lingwood, Corn Factor Norwich Pet Sept 13 Ord Oct 13
 SCHOFIELD, JAMES, Hollinwood, Commission Agent Old-ham Pet Oct 15 Ord Oct 11
 SHARP, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Ironmonger Birmingham Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 11
 SMITH, WALTER FREDERICK, and SAMUEL HASTOOS, Rhod-ditch, Emery Cloth Manufacturers High Court Pet Sept 30 Ord Oct 11
 SPARGO, NICHOLAS, Llanyrdydilad, Gent Bangor Pet Sept 8 Ord Oct 12
 STONE, ALFRED HENRY, Cheltenham, Decorator Cheltenham Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 4
 TAYLOR, CHARLES, Sandhurst, Laundryman Reading Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 TETLOW, JOHN, and GEORGE NAYLOR TETLOW, Hyde Mineral Water Manufacturers Stalybridge Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 13
 THOMAS, THOMAS WATKIN, Treheris, Grocer Merthyr Tydfil Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 10
 TURNER, JOHN, Leicester, Carpenter Leicester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 WADE, WED, Stanningley, Coal Merchant Bradford Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 WALL, CHARLES CLIFFORD, Worcester, Baker Worcester Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11

WIDDOWSON, JOSEPH, Hathern, Framework Knitter Leicester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 WILSON, HERBERT FISHER, Halifax, Builder Halifax Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 WILSON, THOMAS STANLEY, Fallsworth, Cardroom Jobber Oldham Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 WOLFE, WILLIAM ALMON, Temple, American Barrister High Court Pet July 3 Ord Oct 11
 WRIGHT, GEORGE, Newton Solney, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13

ADJUDICATION ANNUATED.

HELMET, MARY ANN, Accrington, Draper Blackburn Adj Nov 6, 1892 Annual Nov 30, 1893

SALE OF ENSUING WEEK.

Oct. 22.—MESSRS. HARMAN BROS., at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Freehold Rental (see advertisement, Oct. 13, p. 800; this week, p. 4).

Subscription, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, which includes Indexes, Digests, Statutes, and Postage, 52s. WEEKLY REPORTER, in wrapper, 6s.; by Post, 28s. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26s. 0d.; by Post, 28s. 0d. Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 9d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM.

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR.

WANTED, in the Office of the Town Clerk of Birmingham, an ASSISTANT SOLICITOR.

He must be a duly qualified Solicitor, well acquainted with Conveyancing, Chancery and Common Law, and have a knowledge of County Court and Magisterial Practice.

He will be required to give up his whole time to the duties, and must not be engaged in private practice or any other employment.

Salary, £300 per annum.

Applications, stating age, and accompanied by recent testimonials, under cover, endorsed "Assistant Solicitor," to be sent to the Town Clerk, Birmingham, not later than the 23rd October instant.

Applicants are requested to observe the above directions, and not to canvass.

Dated this 9th day of October, 1894.

EDWARD ORFORD SMITH, Town Clerk.
 Council House, Birmingham.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

LAW CLASSES.

These Classes are specially adapted for Students preparing for the LL.B. Degree in the University of London, and for the Indian Civil Service Examinations. Jurisprudence, Indian Law, and Constitutional Law and Constitutional History.—Prof. A. Henry, M.A., LL.B. Roman Law.—Prof. A. Murison, M.A. Students are admitted to all Classes without previous examination.—Prospectuses may be obtained from the College, Gower-street, W.C.
 J. M. HORSBURGH, M.A., Secretary.

LAW.—Practice Wanted.—A Retired Solicitor, of ability and reputation, with ample capital, wishing to resume work, desires to Purchase sound Connection.—Address, in confidence, LEX, care of Munton & Morris, Solicitors, 26a, Queen Victoria-street, London.

PARTNERSHIP.—Solicitor (Honours), age 31, seven years Managing in London, desires Partnership or Clerkship with view thereto.—Address, in strict confidence, NORTHERN, "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

YOUNG SOLICITOR (B.A. Oxon.), Articled in London, admitted June, 1894, desires Engagement; Conveyancing or Chancery, under supervision.—Address, C. S. BIGG, 17, Longbridge-road, London, S.W.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE



MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

Corporation Robes, University and Clergy Gowns

ESTABLISHED 1699.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

REVERSIONS, ANNUITIES, LIFE INTERESTS, LIFE POLICIES, &c.

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & ORAN-FIELD (successors to Marsh, Milner, & Co.), Land and Reversion Valuers and Auctioneers, may be consulted upon all questions appertaining to the above interests. Their Periodical Sales (established by the late Mr. H. B. Marsh in 1843) occur on the First Thursday in each Month throughout the year, and are the recognised medium for realising this description of property. Advances made, if required, pending completion, or permanent mortgages negotiated.—Address, 6, Poultry, London, E.C.

MESSRS. STIMSON & SONS,

Auctioneers, Surveyors, and Valuers,
 8, MOORGATE STREET, BANK, E.C.,

AND

2, NEW KENT ROAD, S.E.
 (Opposite the Elephant and Castle).

AUCTION SALES are held at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, City, on the second and last Thursdays in each month and on other days as occasion may require.

STIMSON & SONS undertake SALES and LETTINGS by PRIVATE TREATY, Valuations, Surveys, Negotiation of Mortgages, Receiverships in Chancery, Sales by Auction of Furniture and Stock, Collection of Rents, &c. Separate printed Lists of House Property, Ground-Rents for Sale, and Houses, &c., to be Let, are issued on the 1st of each month, and can be had gratis on application or free by post for two stamps. No charge for insertion. Telegraphic address, "Servabo, London."

AUCTION SALES AT DEPTFORD, WOOLWICH, LONDON, AND ELSEWHERE.

MESSRS. HARDS & BRADLY, Auctioneers, Estate Agents, and Valuers, hold Periodical SALES at the "DOVER CASTLE," DEPTFORD; 31, GREEN'S END, WOOLWICH; at the MART, CITY, and elsewhere. Messrs. Hards & Bradly, who also undertake Rent Collections, Surveys and Valuations for all purposes, will be pleased to quote terms for the Sale of Properties intended to be submitted to Public Auction or otherwise.—Offices: Greenwich; 31, Green's End, Woolwich; and 158, Fenchurch-street, E.C.

AUCTION SALES.

MESSRS. FIELD & SONS' AUCTIONS

take place MONTHLY, at the MART, and include every description of House Property. Printed terms can be had on application at their Offices. Messrs. Field & Sons undertake surveys of all kinds, and give special attention to Rating and Compensation Claims. Offices: 54, Borough High-street, and 53, Chancery-lane, W.C.

MESSRS. H. GROGAN & CO., 101, Park-

street, Grosvenor-square, beg to call the attention of intending Purchasers to the many attractive West-End Houses which they have for Sale. Particulars on application. Surveys and Valuations attended to.

FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS WANTED with Reversions to the rack rentals in from 6 to 25 years; the south side of London rather preferred; several thousand pounds ready for immediate investment.—Owners or their solicitors please send full particulars direct to the intending purchaser, J. H. BILLINGHURST, 137, Marine-parade, Brighton, Sussex.

TO TRUSTEES, Executors, and Tradesmen.—THE LONDON AND MIDLAND ASSETS COMPANY (LIMITED) are prepared to Purchase Book or other kind of Debt, in any part of the United Kingdom.—Address, with particulars, to SECRETARY, 14 & 15, Coleman-street, London, E.C.

TO CAPITALISTS.—Finance Wanted for a Patent Non-Vibrating Wheel for Cabs, Carriages, Omnibuses, &c. Novel in principle, and has been thoroughly tested, having run thousands of miles in daily cab use; is as quiet as rubber, runs cleaner, is thirty per cent. lighter in traction, and thrice as durable; a bond fide property; would Sell Share or Work with Syndicate or Company.—Replies to C.F., 517, Messrs. Deacon's, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

TWENTY GUINEAS FEE will be Paid for an Introduction to a suitable Resident Patient by a Medical Man holding an important official position, and residing in a large and handsome house in the West of London; special advantages as to treatment and comfort, and use of carriage and pair if required.—Address, MEDICUS, care of Henry Whitlock, Ltd., Holland-gate, Kensington, London, W.

OFFICES to be LET.—Two large, well-lighted Rooms on 2nd Floor, rent £70; also large Ground-Floor Offices, vacant at Ladyday, rent £150.—Apply to W. CARPENTIER & SONS, on Premises, 5, Laurence Pountney-lane, Cannon-street, E.C.

LIFE
&c.

CRAN-
Co.), Land
consulted
Interests.
Mr. H. E.
each Month
medium for
made, if
mortgages

ONS,

C.,

o Mart,
and last
occasion

ETTINGS
negotiation
Auction
Separate
for Sale,
c of each
r free by
a. Tele-

WICH,

Auc-
periodical
RD: 31,
ITY, and
undertake
purposes,
properties
therwise.
ich; and

TIONS

l include
irms can
Field &
special
Offices:
T.C.

Park-
ention of
Test-End
applic-

NTED

6 to 25
several
Owners
ct to the
Marine-

rades-
COMPANY
r kind of
ces, with
n-street,

ed for
urriages,
as been
in daily
irty per
head for
ticate at
Lenden-

Paid
tient by
ion, and
West of
comfort.
Address,
ad-gate,

well-
so large
£150.-
attiremen